

ΕΤΕΤΗΡΙΟΝ

ΕΤΑΙΡΕΙΑΣ ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΝΩΝ ΓΡΑΜΜΕΩΝ

ΕΤΟΣ ΚΓ'

Εβραεύθη ὑπὸ τῆς Ἀκαδημίας Ἀθηνῶν καὶ τοῦ ἐν Παρίσις
Συλλόγου πρὸς ἐρίσχυσιν τῶν Ἑλληνικῶν Σπουδῶν.



ἈΘΗΝΑΙ 1953

ΚΑΝΙΣΚΙΟΝ
ΦΑΙΔΩΝΙ Ι. ΚΟΥΚΟΥΛΕ

ΠΩΣ Η ΛΕΞΙΣ *θέμα* ΕΦΘΑΣΕΝ ΕΙΣ ΤΗΝ ΣΗΜΑΣΙΑΝ ΤΗΣ ΣΤΡΑΤΙΩΤΙΚΗΣ ΠΕΡΙΟΧΗΣ

Κατὰ τὴν περὶ τὰ θέματα ἀσχολίαν μου μοῦ ἐγεννήθη ἡ ἀπορία πόθεν ἡ λέξις ἔλαβε τὴν σημασίαν τῆς στρατιωτικῆς ἐπαρχίας, τὴν ὁποίαν ἔχει κατὰ τοὺς μετὰ τὸν Ἡράκλειον χρόνους.

Ὡς γνωστόν, ἡ λέξις παράγεται ἀπὸ τοῦ ῥήματος τίθημι καὶ σημαίνει τὸ τιθέμενον, τὸ τοποθετούμενον. Εἰς τὰ λεξικά τῆς ἀρχαίας ἑλληνικῆς ὡς σημασίαι αὐτοῦ ἀναγράφονται αἱ ἑξῆς: 1) Τὸ κατατιθέμενον πρὸς φύλαξιν. 2) Σωρός. 3) Θήκη. 4) Ὡροσκόπιον. 5) Τόπος ταφῆς. 6) Τὸ τιθέμενον ὡς ἐπαθλον. 7) Τὸ τιθέμενον πρὸς συζήτησιν ἢ διμιλίαν. 8) Τὸ καθ' ὑπόθεσιν τιθέμενον. 9) Τὸ θέμα τῆς λέξεως. 10) Εἶδος συλλογισμοῦ τῶν Στωϊκῶν καὶ 11) ἔν τινι ἐπιγραφῇ ἡ λέξις φαίνεται νὰ σημαίνῃ τὸν τόπον, εἰς ὃν καθωρίσθησαν ὀρισμένοι ἄγροί δι' ὀρισμένους ἀνθρώπους. Κατὰ τὸν ἐκδότην τῆς ἐπιγραφῆς: «*quo loco singuli agri singulis hominibus adsignati siti fuerint*».

Ἐξ ὧν τούτων τῶν σημασιῶν νομίζω ὅτι εἶναι πολὺν δύσκολον νὰ προέκυψεν ἡ βυζαντινὴ σημασία τῆς λέξεως, ἡ ὁποία, ὡς γνωστόν, δηλοῖ ὅτε μὲν τὰς στρατιωτικὰς ἐπαρχίας, ὅτε δὲ καὶ αὐτὰς ταύτας τὰς στρατιωτικὰς μονάδας, τὰς ἐγκατεστημένας εἰς αὐτάς. Ἡ μόνη ἴσως σημασία, ἐκ τῆς ὁποίας θὰ ἠδύνατο νὰ ὀρμηθῇ ἡ βυζαντινὴ, εἶναι ἡ τελευταία, ἡ δηλοῦσα ὁπωσδήποτε τόπον. Τὴν σημασίαν ταύτην ἀναγράφει ἀορίστως καὶ ὁ Ἡσύχιος ἐρμηνεύων τὴν λέξιν θέμα: «*ἕξις, τόπος, στάσις, μνῆμα*». Ἀλλὰ καὶ αὐτὴ εἶναι καθ' ἑαυτὴν ἀρχετὰ ἀσαφὲς καὶ προβληματικὴ.

Ὑπάρχει ὁμοίως καὶ μία βυζαντινὴ σημασία τῆς λέξεως *τίθημι*, ἡ ὁποία ἔμεινεν ἀπαράτητος, ἐκ τῆς ὁποίας θὰ ἠδύνατο ἴσως νὰ εὑρεθῇ ὁ δρόμος τῆς ἐξελίξεως μέχρι τοῦ στρατιωτικοῦ σώματος καὶ τῆς στρατιωτικῆς περιοχῆς.

Εἰς τὰ Θαύματα τοῦ Ἁγίου Δημητρίου (PG, 117, στ. 1373) γράφεται: «*Ὁ αὐτὸς Μαῦρος πυρετῷ χαλεπωτάτῳ ἐκ τῆς ἀθυμίας περιπεσὼν κατέθηκεν ἐπὶ κλίνης ἐπὶ πλείονας ἡμέρας*». Εἰς τὴν φράσιν ταύτην τὸ ῥήμα *κατέθηκεν* προδήλως σημαίνει ὅτι καὶ τὸ *κατέκλιθη*, *ἐκοιτάσθη ἐπὶ κλίνης*, *ἔπεσε ἢ ἐπλάγιασε* στὸ κρεβάτι, ὅπως θὰ ἐλέγομεν σήμερον. Μὲ παρομοίαν σημασίαν ἀπαντᾷ καὶ εἰς συναξάριον τοῦ Ζ' αἰῶνος, δημοσιευθὲν ὑπὸ τοῦ Παπαδοπούλου—Κεραμέως εἰς τὰ *Varia Græca Sacra*: «*Ὁ οὖν Πέτρος... μετὰ τὸ πληρῶσαι τὴν πάννυχον ὑμνωδίαν ἔθηκεν ἑαυτὸν*

πλησίον αὐτοῦ καὶ ἀπεκοιμήθη». Τὸ *ἔθηκεν ἑαυτὸν* σημαίνει *κατέκλινεν ἑαυτόν*, *ἐπλάγιασεν ἢ ἔπεσεν ἐπὶ τῆς κλίνης*.

Ἡ σημασία αὕτη τοῦ τίθημι, ἐξ οὗ τὸ νεώτερον *θέτω*, ἀπαντᾷ καὶ σήμερον εἰς τὴν Κρήτην καὶ τὴν Δωδεκάνησον, ὅπου ἀκριβῶς τὸ ῥήμα τοῦτο σημαίνει ὅ,τι εἰς τὰς ἄλλας διαλέκτους τὸ *πλαγιάζω*, δηλ. *κατακλίνομαι*, τὸ δὲ παράγωγον *θεσά* σημαίνει τὸ μέρος, ὅπου κατακλίνεται τις, δηλ. τὴν *κλίνην*, τὴν *κοίτην*. Ἐν Ἀδριανουπόλει ἡ λέξις *θέσι* δηλοῖ τὴν παστάδα. Παράγωγον *θέμα*, σημαῖνον τὴν κλίνην, καθ' ὅσον γνωρίζω, μέχρι σήμερον δὲν ἐσημειώθη, δὲν εἶναι ὅμως καθόλου ἀπίθανον νὰ εὑρεθῇ κάπου, ὅπως δὲν εἶναι ἀπίθανον νὰ ὑπῆρχε καὶ παλαιότερον. Κατὰ ταῦτα ἡ λέξις *θέμα*, ὅπως ἀκριβῶς ἡ λέξις *στῶμα*, ἐδήλωσε κατὰ τοὺς βυζαντινοὺς χρόνους τὸν τόπον, ὅπου κατακλίνεται τις, ὅπου κοιτάζεται.

Ἐντεῦθεν ἡ ἐξέλιξις τῆς στρατιωτικῆς σημασίας τῆς λέξεως εἶναι πλέον, νομίζω, προφανής. Καθ' ὃν δηλ. τρόπον ἡ λέξις *κοίτη* εἰς τὴν κοινὴν ἀρχικῶς μὲν ἐδήλου τὸν τόπον, ὅπου κοιτάζεται τις, ὅπου κοιμάται, κατόπιν δὲ ἐδήλωσε καὶ τὸν στρατιωτικὸν σταθμόν, οἷον ἡ *κοίτη τῶν φυλακιστῶν*, κατὰ τὸν αὐτὸν τρόπον ἡ λέξις *θέμα* ἐδήλωσε τὸ κατάλυμα τῶν στρατιωτῶν, τὸν στρατῶνα, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ αὐτὸ τὸ σῶμα.

Ἡ λέξις *θέμα* ὡς ἰσοδύναμος μὲ τὴν λέξιν *τάγμα* ἀπαντᾷ εἰς τὸ λεγόμενον Στρατηγικὸν τοῦ Μαυρικίου, ἀλλ' ἤδη ὑπὸ τοῦ παλαιοῦ ἐκδότου Schæfer διωρθώθη εἰς *τάγμα*, εἰς τὴν διόρθωσιν δ' ἐνέμεινε καὶ ὁ Vari, φρονῶν ὅτι κατὰ τοὺς χρόνους τῆς συγγραφῆς τοῦ τακτικοῦ ἡ λέξις *θέμα* ἦτο ἄγνωστος. Ἡ διόρθωσις φαίνεται εὐλογος, ἀλλὰ δὲν εἶναι ἀσφαλής. Διότι εἰς τὸ Στρατηγικὸν ἡ λέξις *θέμα* δὲν δηλοῖ τὴν στρατιωτικὴν ἐπαρχίαν, οὔτε καὶ τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ ἐδρεῖον μέγα στρατιωτικὸν σῶμα, ἀλλ' ἀπλῶς μικρὰν ὑποδιαίρεσιν, τὸ *τάγμα* ἢ καὶ τι μικρότερον. Δυσκόλως δὲ δικαιολογεῖται ἡ ἀντικατάστασις τῆς λέξεως *τάγμα* διὰ τῆς λέξεως *θέμα* ὑπὸ τῶν ἀντιγραφέων. Δυστυχῶς ἀμφότεροι οἱ ἐκδόται δὲν παρέχουν εἰς τὸ σημεῖον τοῦτο τὰ στοιχεῖα τῆς χειρογράφου παραδόσεως, ὥστε νὰ δυνηθῇ τις νὰ κρίνῃ, ἐὰν ὀρθῶς ἢ ἐσφαλμένως ἐγένετο ἡ διόρθωσις.

Παρομοία ὑπῆρξε καὶ ἡ ἐξέλιξις τῆς σημασίας τῆς ἀρχαίας στρατιωτικῆς λέξεως *λόχος*, ἣτις ἐκ τοῦ *λέχομαι* παραγομένη ἐδήλωσεν ἀρχικῶς τὸν τόπον τῆς ἐνέδρας, ὅπου φρυκτὰ οἱ ἄνδρες ἔπρεπε νὰ εἶναι κατακεκλιμένοι, διὰ νὰ μὴ εἶναι ὀρατοί, κατόπιν δὲ προσέλαβε τὴν σημασίαν τοῦ γνωστοῦ στρατιωτικοῦ σώματος. Τὸ ἴδιον συνέβη καὶ μὲ τὰς λατινικὰς λέξεις *cohors*, *exercitus*, *contubernium* κλπ.

Ὡς τεκμήριον τῆς πιθανότητος τῶν ἀνωτέρω σκέψεων δύνανται, νομίζω, νὰ χρησιμεύσουν καὶ τὰ ἀκόλουθα. Τὰ παλαιότερα θέματα, οἷον τὸ τοῦ Ὀρμικίου, τὸ τῶν Βουκελλαρίων, τὸ τῶν Ἰκανάτων, ὡς γνωστόν, δὲν ὀνομάζονται ἀπὸ τῆς γεωγραφικῆς περιφερείας, ὅπου ἐξετείνοντο, ὅπως τὰ νεώ-

τερα, οἷον θέμα Μακεδονίας, Θράκης, Καππαδοκίας κλπ., ἀλλ' ἀπὸ τῶν στρατιωτικῶν σωμάτων, τὰ ὁποῖα ἦσαν ἐγκατεστημένα εἰς αὐτά, δηλ. θέμα τοῦ ὀψικίου, θέμα τῶν βουκελλαρίων, θέμα τῶν ἱκανάτων, ἀρκετὰ δὲ βραδύτερον ἐλέχθησαν κατ' ὀνομαστικὴν, οἷον παρὰ Κωνσταντίνῳ τῷ Πορφυρογεννήτῳ θέμα τὸ 'Οψίκιον, θέμα τὸ 'Οπίματον καὶ εἴ τι παρόμοιον. Κατ' αὐτὰ ἐλέχθησαν κατὰ γενικὴν καὶ τὰ συγχρόνως ἢ εὐθὺς κατόπιν σχηματισθέντα θέματα, οἷον θέμα τῶν Θρακησίων, τῶν 'Ανατολικῶν, τῶν 'Αρμενιάκων, τῶν Παφλαγόνων, τῶν Κιβυρραιωτῶν καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο, καὶ βραδύτερον κατ' ὀνομαστικὴν, οἷον θέμα τὸ Θρακήσιον, τὸ 'Ανατολικόν, τὸ 'Αρμενιάκον κτλ. Κατ' ἀρχὰς δηλονότι θέμα τοῦ ὀψικίου ἐκαλεῖτο πιθανώτατα ἐν Κωνσταντινουπόλει ὁ τόπος, ὁ στρατῶν, ὅπου διέμενεν ἡ στρατιωτικὴ ἀκολουθία τοῦ βασιλέως, δηλ. τὸ ὀψίκιον, μετεφέρθη δὲ κατόπιν τὸ ὄνομα εἰς τὴν Βιθυνίαν, ὅταν καθωρίσθη αὕτη ὡς τόπος διαμονῆς τῶν ἀποτελούντων τὸ ὀψίκιον.

Ἄς μοι ἐπιτραπῇ δ' εἰς τὸ σημεῖον αὐτὸ νὰ κάμω καὶ μίαν ὑπόθεσιν.

Ἐν τοῖς πρακτικοῖς τῆς Γ' Οἰκουμένης Συνόδου τοῦ 680 μεταξὺ τῶν παραστάντων εἰς αὐτὴν στρατιωτικῶν ἀναφέρεται καὶ «Θεόδωρος ἐνδοξότατος ἀπὸ ὑπάτων πατρίκιος, κόμης τοῦ βασιλικοῦ ὀψικίου καὶ ὑποστράτηγος Θράκης», ὅπερ δηλοῖ ὅτι ὁ κόμης τοῦ ὀψικίου εἶχε συγχρόνως ὑπὸ τὰς διαταγὰς του καὶ τὰ στρατεύματα τῆς Θράκης μὲ τὸν τίτλον τοῦ ὑποστρατήγου. Τὸ πρᾶγμα συμφωνεῖ καὶ πρὸς τὰς πληροφορίας τοῦ Πορφυρογεννήτου, κατὰ τὰς ὁποίας «τὸ τῆς Θράκης θέμα ὑπὸ τὸν βασιλέα Κωνσταντινουπόλεως ἐτέτακτο καὶ εἰς ὑπουργίαν αὐτοῦ ἐχρημάτιζε καὶ οὐδέπω τις στρατηγὸς ἦν ἐν αὐτῷ». Ὅτε λοιπὸν τὸ βασιλικὸν ὀψίκιον μετετέθη εἰς τὴν Βιθυνίαν, ὅπως πιστεύω κατὰ τὸ 688, ὑπὸ τοῦ Ἰουστινιανοῦ τοῦ Β', ὅστις ἵδρυσεν τὸ ἐκ Σλάβων ἀποτελούμενον σῶμα, τὸν *περιούσιον*, ὅπως τὸν ἀπεκάλεσε, *λαόν*, μετετέθησαν τότε καὶ τὰ ὑπὸ τὸν κόμητα τοῦ ὀψικίου ὑπηρετοῦντα θρακικὰ στρατεύματα εἰς τὴν γειννιάζουσαν πρὸς τὴν Βιθυνίαν Λυδίαν, ἐξ ὧν ἔλαβε τὸ ὄνομα τὸ θέμα τῶν Θρακησίων, διότι βέβαια οἱ αἰτιολογικοὶ μῦθοι τοῦ Πορφυρογεννήτου περὶ τοῦ ὀνόματος τοῦ θέματος τούτου δὲν δύνανται νὰ εἶναι πιστευτοί.

Ἀναγνωρίζω ὅτι αἱ σκέψεις, τὰς ὁποίας ἐξέθεσα, δὲν εἶναι ἀναντιρρήτως ἀποδεδειγμέναι. Εἰς τὴν παράδοσιν ὑπάρχουν κενὰ καὶ ὅπου αἱ πηγαὶ σιωποῦν εἶναι φυσικὸν νὰ κινώμεθα εἰς τὸ ἐπισφαλὲς ἔδαφος τῶν ὑποθέσεων καὶ πιθανοτήτων. Ἐλπίζω ὅμως ὅτι αἱ ὑποθέσεις, τὰς ὁποίας ἔκαμα, εἶναι τοῦλάχιστον πιθαναὶ καὶ δύνανται νὰ δώσουν ἀφορμὴν εἰς εἰδικωτέρους καὶ σοφωτέρους ἐμοῦ περὶ τὰ βυζαντινὰ πράγματα πρὸς περαιτέρω ἔρευναν.

ΣΤΙΛΠΩΝ Π. ΚΥΡΙΑΚΙΔΗΣ

ΠΕΡΙ ΤΗΝ ΠΡΩΤΗΝ ΜΝΕΙΑΝ ΤΩΝ ΑΛΒΑΝΩΝ ΕΝ ΤΑΙΣ ΕΚΚΛΗΣΙΑΣΤΙΚΑΙΣ ΠΗΓΑΙΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΑ ΟΡΙΑ ΤΗΣ ΧΩΡΑΣ ΤΩΝ ΕΠΙ ΒΥΖΑΝΤΙΝΩΝ

Τὸ ὄνομα Ἀλβανία ἐμφανίζεται, ὡς γνωστόν, τὸ πρῶτον παρὰ τῷ γνωστῷ γεωγράφῳ τοῦ β' μ.Χ. αἰῶνος Πτολεμαίῳ¹. Οὗτος, γράφων περὶ τῆς Ἰλλυρίας, ὡς χώρας ἀνηκούσης εἰς τὴν ρωμαϊκὴν ἐπαρχίαν τῆς Μακεδονίας², ἀναφέρει τὸ πρῶτον τοὺς Ἀλβανούς καὶ «Ἀλβανον πόλιν», ἧς τὰ εἰρηπια, κατὰ τὸν Hahn³, σφίζονται παρὰ τὴν Κροΐαν, ὀνομαζόμενα ἐνδεικτικῶς Ἀρμπουννα.

Ἡ κρατοῦσα γνώμη⁴ εἶναι, ὅτι τὸ ὄνομα ἐξαφανίζεται ἐπὶ πολλοὺς αἰῶνας διὰ νὰ ἐμφανισθῇ κατὰ τὰ μέσα τοῦ ια' καὶ ἀρχὰς τοῦ ιβ' αἰῶνος,

¹ Γεωγραφικῆς ὑψηγίσεως Γ' κεφάλαιον, 3, 12, παράγραφ. 20, ἔκδ. Müller, σελ. 505-506: 17. *Πόλεις δὲ εἰσιν ἐν τῇ Μακεδονίᾳ μεσόγειοι αἷδε. Ταυαντίων Ἀρμισσα. 18. Ἐλιμιωτῶν Ἐλιμία. 19. Ὀρεσιίδος Ἀμανία. 20. Ἀλβανῶν Ἀλβανόπολις κλπ.* (Πλείονα παρὰ Φουρίκη, ἐν Ἀθηνῶν, 1931, σ. 3 ἑξ.).

² Ἴδε τὰ ὅρια τῆς Μακεδονίας παρὰ Στεράβωνι καὶ εἰς τὴν ἐμὴν Ἑκκλ. Ἱστορίαν τῆς Ἑλλάδος, τόμ. Α', σελ. 201-202.

³ Albanische Studien, Jena 1854. Ὁ Κων. Jirecek εἰς μελέτην του ὑπὸ τὸν τίτλον Albanien in der Vergangenheit, δημοσιευθεῖσαν εἰς τὰς Illyrisch-Albanische Forschungen τοῦ L. v. Thallóczy, I, München und Leipzig 1916, σελ. 66, παρατηρεῖ, ὅτι τὸ ὄνομα τῶν Ἀλβανῶν, τῶν ἀναφερομένων ὑπὸ τοῦ Πτολεμαίου, ἔνεκα τῆς στρατηγικῆς σπουδαιότητος τῶν δυσπροσίτων ἐγκαταστάσεων των, μετεφέρθη ἐφ' ὅλων τῶν ὑπολειμμάτων τῶν Παλαιῶν Ἰλλυριῶν. Ἡ χώρα ἢ περὶ τὴν Κροΐαν καὶ τὸ Ἐλβασάν καλεῖται ἀπὸ τοῦ ια' μέχρι τοῦ ιε' αἰῶνος παρὰ τοῖς Βυζαντινοῖς Ἀρβανον ἢ Ἀλβανον, λατινιστὶ Arbanum, ἀρχαιοσερβιστὶ Raban. Τὸν λαὸν ὀνόμαζέ τις, μὲ σταθερὰν ἐναλλαγὴν μεταξὺ τοῦ λ καὶ ρ, ἑλληνιστὶ Ἀλβανοὶ ἢ Ἀρβανοί, ἢ Ἀλβανῖται ἢ Ἀρβανῖται, λατινιστὶ Arbanenses ἢ Albanenses. Ἀπὸ τὸν λατινικὸν ἢ ρωμανικὸν τύπον προήλθε καὶ τὸ σλαβικὸν Arbanasi, ἐκ δὲ τοῦ νεοελληνικοῦ, οἱ Ἀρβανῖτες, τελικῶς τὸ τουρκικὸν Arnaut. Οἱ Ἀλβανοὶ καλοῦσιν ἑαυτοὺς Arber ἢ Arben. Νεώτερον εἶναι τὸ ὄνομα Schkipetaren (κατὰ τὸν G. Meyer ἀπὸ τὸ λατ. excipio = ἀκούω, μαρθάνω), ὅπερ εἶναι ἄγνωστον εἰς τοὺς εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα Ἀλβανούς ἐποίκους τοῦ ιε' αἰῶνος. Ἡ γλῶσσα διαιρεῖται εἰς δύο πολὺ διαφερούσας διαλέκτους, τῶν βορείων καὶ τῶν νοτιῶν (Τόσκηδων).

⁴ Κ. Ἀμάντου: Οἱ Βόρειοι Γεῖτονες τῆς Ἑλλάδος, ἐν Ἀθήναις 1923, Ἱστορία τοῦ Βυζ. Κράτους, τόμ. Α', ἑκδόσις Β', σ. 213, ἐν Ἀθήναις 1953.

Ἡ ἀρχιτέκτων τοῦ εἰς μιναρὲν μετατραπέντος κτίσματος πύργου τῆς Ἀγίας Σοφίας Θεσσαλονίκης εἶχεν ὑπ' ὄψιν τοῦ παλαιότερου ὑπόδειγμα ἢ ἐπρωτοτύπησεν; Ἡ λύσις τοῦ προβλήματος τούτου ἀνήκει εἰς τοὺς εἰδικοὺς τῆς τέχνης.

Ὁ ἄλλος δὲ συνήθης μιναρὲς τῆς Ἀγίας Σοφίας, ὁ ὁποῖος ὑψοῦται εἰς τὸ ἀντίστοιχον ἄκρον δεξιὸν τοῦ ναοῦ, δὲν εἶναι δυνατόν νὰ ἔχη κτισθῇ πρὸ τοῦ 1669¹ εἶναι μεταγενέστερος καὶ δὲν γνωρίζομεν περὶ αὐτοῦ τίποτε τὸ συγκεκριμένον. Ὁ Diehl, Le Tourneau, Saladin, οἱ ὅποιοι προσδιώρισαν τὴν παλαιὰν ἀποστολὴν τοῦ πύργου τῆς Ἀγίας Σοφίας, δὲν ἀναφέρουν πότε ιδρύθη ὁ συνήθους τύπου μιναρὲς, ἴσως διότι δὲν ἐνδιαφέρθησαν νὰ ἐξακριβώσουν τοῦτο, ὡς μὴ ἀφορῶν εἰς τὴν μελέτην των. Τὸ ὅτι ὁ μιναρὲς οὗτος ἵστατο καὶ πρὸ τοῦ 1890 δὲν σημαίνει ὅτι ἵστατο καὶ ἐπὶ τῆς ἐποχῆς τοῦ Chadschi Chalfa. Τὸ πρόβλημα τοῦ ἀκριβοῦς ἔτους τῆς ἀνεγέρσεώς του θὰ τὸ λύσῃ μόνον ἡ πληροφορία νέας γραπτῆς πηγῆς.

ΑΠΟΣΤ. Ε. ΒΑΚΑΛΟΠΟΥΛΟΣ

στατινούπολις 1870, σελ. 195, 234. Εἰκόνα τοῦ κωδωνοστασίου - μιναρὲ τούτου, βλ. εἰς Δ. Η. Οἰκονομίδου, Ὁ Πόντος καὶ τὰ δίκαια τοῦ ἐν αὐτῷ Ἑλληνισμοῦ, Ἀθῆναι 1920, σελ. 38, φωτογραφία 4η.

THE TERM **HELLADIKOI** IN BYZANTINE TEXTS OF THE SIXTH, SEVENTH AND EIGHTH CENTURIES

Theophanes, as is well known, twice uses the term *Helladikoi* to refer to the inhabitants of what presumably was the theme of Hellas¹. Finlay, commenting on this use of the term remarked: «At the beginning of the eighth century we find the native Greeks called *Helladikoi* by Byzantine writers in order to distinguish them from the ancient Hellenes and from the Ramaioi or Greeks of the Roman empire. The word was a contemptuous name for them as mere provincials»².

Finlay's statement that *Helladikoi* was a term used in a contemptuous sense was first challenged by J. B. Bury. He wrote in 1892³: «*Helladikoi* meant the inhabitants of the theme *Hellas*, which was only a small part of Hellas, either modern or ancient. It did not include the Peloponnesus which constituted another theme; the Peloponnesians were not *Helladikoi*. Nor did it include the western part of Greece north of the isthmus which formed the theme of Nicopolis. The passages in Theophanes do not give the slightest ground for supposing either that the word had a wider signification than the theme of Hellas, or that there was anything contemptuous about it. *Helladikoi*, formed on the analogy of *Armeniakoi* and *Anatolikoi*, had a purely administrative, and not a national meaning. The folk of the theme of Hellas could not be called Hellenes, because that famous name had acquired a theological meaning; so they were most fitly

¹ Theophanes, *Chronographia*, edited by C. de Boor, I (Leipzig 1883), 405; 474.

² George Finlay, *A History of Greece*, edited by H. F. Tozer, I (Oxford 1877), 405.

³ J. B. Bury, *The Helladikoi* (*The English Historical Review*, 17, 1892, 80-81). Bury had expressed substantially the same view three years earlier. See his *History of the Later Roman Empire from Arcadius to Irene* (London 1889), 2, 437 f.

called *Helladikoi* and thus brought into line with their fellow subjects of the Anatolic and Armeniac themes».

That Bury was right in denying any contemptuous sense to the term *Helladikoi* there can be no doubt¹. The observation of Bees that Byzantine writers often referred to the inhabitants of Greece proper with contempt has no bearing on the term *Helladikoi*, for the texts which he used to support his opinion employ the term Hellenes and not *Helladikoi*². It can be questioned, however, if Bury was right in denying that the Peloponnesians were *Helladikoi* and in maintaining that *Helladikoi* was «formed on the analogy of *Armeniakoi* and *Anatolikoi*».

Bees has observed that *Helladikoi* came to be used to refer to the inhabitants of the theme Hellas and in general to those of the country south of Olympus, especially of the Peloponnesus, because the term Hellenes had become synonymous with the term pagans³. That this was the real reason for the use of *Helladikoi* had also been expressed, some years earlier, by N. G. Polites. Polites wrote in 1901⁴: «And it happened during the early years of the prevalence of Christianity in the empire, when the name of the Romans had not yet spread as an ethnic of the subjects of the newly formed Eastern Roman empire, that there returned into common use old and forgotten national names of the Greeks. Henceforth perhaps one called *Helladikoi*, i.e., by an appellation which we find in the philosopher Xenophanes of the sixth century B. C., the inhabitants of Greece proper». But despite the opinion of these two Greek scholars, it is the view of Bury that has generally prevailed. The Frenchman A. Bon, for instance, has written recently⁵: «In our opinion the very use of the term *Ἑλλαδικοί* is cha-

¹ But one may still read the following in the *Enciclopedia Italiana*, 17 (1933), 900: Negli scrittori bizantini questo popolo, a partire dal sec. VIII, è indicato col nome di *Helladikoi* per distinguerlo tanto dagli antichi Elleni quanto dai *Romaioi* (Romei), civè dai Greci dell'impero; e il nome aveva un senso dispregiativo.

² Nikos A. Bees, *Helladikoi* (Wiener Studien, Zeitschrift für klassische Philologie, 40, Vienna 1919, 169-171).

³ Bees, *Ἑλλαδικοί*, in *Ἐλευθερουδάκη Ἐγκυκλοπαίδ. Λεξικόν*, 5 (1929), 292.

⁴ N. G. Polites, *Ἕλληνες ἢ Ῥωμαῖοι*, in *Λαογραφικά Σύμμεικτα*, 1 (1920), 124. This article first appeared in 1901. It was called to my attention by George Soules who, in my opinion, is fast becoming a first-rate scholar.

⁵ A. Bon, *Le Péloponnèse Byzantin jusqu'en 1204* (Paris 1951), p. 38, n. 2.

racteristic; indeed, if it already exists in antiquity..., it appears here in order to avoid confusing the Hellenes in general with the inhabitants of Hellas taken in its narrow sense; equivalent, for instance, with *Ἀρμενιοί* or *Ἀνατολικοί*, it has the value, at least for the sense, of an administrative neologism. In our opinion one has wrongly explained the use of the term by the desire to distinguish from the true Greeks of former times the new population strongly mixed as the result of the invasions, or by the care to avoid the name of *Ἕλληνες* considered as a synonyme of pagans, a use which it may sometimes have». More recently still Ostrogorsky has written¹: «Contrary to Finlay, who was of the opinion that this name [*Helladikoi*] served in the Middle Ages to designate the natives of Greece in order to distinguish them from the ancient Hellenes and the *Romaioi* of the rest of the Byzantine Empire and to refer to them with a certain contempt as provincials, Bury demonstrated brilliantly not only that it did not even refer to the natives of all of Greece, but that it designated exclusively the inhabitants of the theme of Hellas which, as Bury specifically emphasizes, consists 'only of a small part of Greece, whether modern or ancient'. *Ἑλλαδικοί* is not a national concept but a military and administrative one. Just as the soldiers and later even the inhabitants of the themes Armeniakon and Anatolikon in Asia Minor were called *Ἀρμενιοί* or *Ἀνατολικοί* so the soldiers and later even the inhabitants of the military theme of Hellas were called *Ἑλλαδικοί*. All this is undoubtedly very correct...»

An examination of the sources, however, shows that Bees and Polites are closer to the truth than either Bury or those who have accepted his views. The term *Helladikoi*, besides the two references in Theophanes which have already been cited, is met with six times in the sources of the sixth and seventh centuries: twice in Cosmas Indicopleustes; three times in Malalas and once in the *Chronicon Paschale*. The term is also used in the *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum* in connection with a practice, no doubt legendary, which is said to have begun in the reign of Constantine the Great and to have ended in that of Justin II.

¹ G. Ostrogorsky, *Postanak Tema Helada i Peloponez* (Iz Zbornika Radova XXI, Vizantoloskog Instituta San Knj. 1, Belgrade 1952, 66 f. I do not read Serbian, but I was able to consult this work in a translation which Michael Petrovich, a brilliant young scholar, now at the University of Wisconsin, made for me.

Now to examine these references. The two in Cosmas are too general and as a consequence yield no precise information. In the one place¹ he tells us that the Ionians and the *Helladikoi* were among the descendants of Japhet; in the other², he mentions the *Helladikoi* among a number of peoples who accepted Christianity. The most that one can infer from these statements is that the *Helladikoi* were the inhabitants of the Greek lands in general. Malalas is much more precise. «*Aegealeus*», he writes in one place, «was the first king of the Sicyonians who are now called *Helladikoi*»³. And elsewhere: «Pelops, from whom the *Helladikoi* came to be called Peloponnesians, ruled for thirty-two years»⁴. Finally there is the reference to Athenaïs, the future Eudocia and wife of Theodosius II. She is called both *Helladike* and *Hellene*; *Helladike* because she was an inhabitant of Greece⁵; *Hellene* because she was a pagan⁶. We find the same preciseness in the *Chronicon Paschale*. The reference here is also to Athenaïs. As in Malalas, she is called *Helladike* because she came from Greece and *Hellenis* because she was a pagan⁷. The reference in the *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum* is to Athenian, Theban and *Helladikoi* philosophers. These philosophers, we are told, used to mount a vaulted portico which Constantine the Great had built and there urged with the Constantinopolitans. Up to the reign of Justin II they were always victorious, but in that reign they were defeated and as a consequence ceased to come⁸. As the *Helladikoi* here are distinguished

¹ Cosmas Indicopleustes, *Topographia Christiana*, Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, 88 (Paris 1860), 85, Winstedt's edition, p. 61.

² Ibid., 169. Winstedt's edition, p. 119.

³ John Malalas, *Chronographia* (Bonn 1831), 68: τῶν δὲ Σικωνίων τῶν νυνὶ λεγόμενων Ἑλλαδικῶν ἐβασίλευσε πρῶτος ὁ Αἰγιάλειος.

⁴ Ibid., 84: ἐβασίλευσεν ὁ Πέλοψ ἔτη λβ', ἐξ οὗ καὶ Πελοποννήσιοι ἐκλήθησαν οἱ Ἑλλαδικοί.

⁵ Ibid., 353: Ἑλλαδικήν, ὀνόματι Ἀθηναΐδα, τὴν καὶ Εὐδοκίαν μετακληθεῖσαν. Also on p. 354.

⁶ Ibid., 355: ἦν γὰρ Ἑλλην, καὶ μετονομάσας αὐτὴν Εὐδοκίαν, ἔλαβεν αὐτὴν εἰς γυναῖκα.

⁷ *Chronicon Paschale* (Bonn 1832), I, 576: Ἑλλαδικήν, ὀνόματι Ἀθηναΐδα. Also on pp. 577-578. And on p. 576: καὶ κρατήσας αὐτὴν ἐποίησε χριστιανήν, ἦν γὰρ Ἑλληνίς, καὶ μετωνόμασεν αὐτὴν Εὐδοκίαν.

⁸ *Scriptores Originum Constantinopolitanarum*, edited by T. Preger, 2 (Leipzig 1907), 229: Τὸν δὲ λιμένα Σοφίας ὁ αὐτὸς ἐκτίσεν Ἰουστίνος εἰς πρόσωπον τῆς γυναικὸς αὐτοῦ Σοφίας. πρὸ δὲ τοῦ κτίσαι τὸν λιμένα ἐπῆρχεν σοῦα καμαροειδής, ἦν ἐκτίσεν ὁ μέγας Κωνσταντῖνος, καὶ ἀνέρχοντο οἱ φιλόσοφοι οἱ δυσικοί. Θηβαῖοι τε καὶ

from the Thebans and the Athenians, they are probably Peloponnesians¹.

These are the references on which any interpretation of the term *Helladikoi* will have to be based. If they indicate anything, they indicate that this term, already known in antiquity², came back into use in the early centuries of the Later Roman Empire, long before the creation of the theme of Hellas as an appellation for the inhabitants of Greece, including, of course, the Peloponnesus. It came to be so used because the more usual term which served for this purpose, that of Hellenes, had assumed a theological connotation, it had become synonymous with pagans. This is clearly shown by the references in Malalas and in the *Chronicon Paschale* when Athenaïs is called both *Helladike* and *Hellenis*, *Helladike* because she was an inhabitant of Greece, *Hellenis* because she was a pagan. It follows, therefore, that the revival of the use of *Helladikoi* by the Byzantines had nothing to do with the creation of the theme of Hellas and Bury and those who accept his views are wrong when they say that «*Helladikoi*, formed on the analogy of *Armeniakoi* and *Anatolikoi*, had a purely administrative, and not a national meaning». It had, of course, a national meaning, although with the creation of the theme of Hellas it came to be restricted to the inhabitants of that theme.

It should be also noted perhaps that the term Hellenes, despite the theological connotation which it assumed, continued to be used to refer to Greeks in the national sense. Procopius, for instance, uses the term in this sense in several places³; it was in the source whence derive both the *Chronicle of Monemvasia* and the *Scholium of Arethas*⁴; and it appears in the *Miracula Sancti Demetrii*⁵. The term,

Ἀθηναῖοι καὶ Ἑλλαδικοὶ καὶ διελέγοντο ἐκείσε μετὰ τῶν Κωνσταντινουπολιτῶν. καὶ διήρκεσε τοῦτο μέχρι Ἰουστίνου καὶ πάντοτε ἐνίκων οἱ δυσικοί. ἐπὶ δὲ Ἰουστίνου ἡττηθέντες οὐδέποτε ἀνῆλθον μέχρι τῆς σήμερον.

¹ Cf. Julius Jüthner, *Hellen und Barbaren*, Aus der Geschichte des Nationalbewusstseins (Leipzig 1923), 114.

² W. Dittenberg, *Ethnika und Verwandtes* (Hermes, 41, 1906, 209 f.).

³ For instance, *De bello persico*, II, 4, 10-11; *De bello gothico*, I, 15, 24; *Anecdota*, XXVI, 30-31. I used Haury's edition.

⁴ P. Charanis, *The chronicle of Monemvasia and the question of the Slavonic settlements in Greece* (Dumbarton Oaks Papers, 5, 1950, 147, 152).

⁵ S. Demetrii Martyris Acta, Migne, *Patrologia Græca*, 116 (Paris 1864), 1293.

however, found its widest use as a synonym of pagans (Evagrius¹ calls even the Saracenes Hellenes) and for this reason it became necessary to find other terms to designate the inhabitants of Greece. One of these terms was *Helladikoi*, another was *Graikoi*², although the latter was sometimes used in a pejorative sense³.

PETER CHARANIS

¹ Evagrius, *Historia Ecclesiastica*, edited by Joseph Bidez and Léon Parmentier (London 1898), 238.

² Cf. Polites, *op. cit.*, 125. Despite my efforts I was not able to procure the work of B. A. Mystakides, *Αἱ λέξεις Ἑλλήν, Γραικός (Γραικύλος), Ρωμαῖος (Γραικορρωμαῖος), Βυζαντινός etc.* (Tübingen 1920).

³ For instance, Procopius, *Anecdota*, XXIV, 7.

Η ΣΧΕΣΙΣ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΛΙΤΕΙΟΛΟΓΙΑΣ ΚΑΙ ΤΗΣ ΠΟΛΙΤΙΚΗΣ ΠΡΟΣ ΤΗΝ ΙΣΤΟΡΙΑΝ

Πρὸς ἐξακρίβωσιν τῆς ὑφισταμένης σχέσεως μεταξύ τῆς πολιτειολογίας καὶ τῆς πολιτικῆς ἀφ' ἑνὸς καὶ τῆς ἱστορίας ἀφ' ἑτέρου εἶναι ἀνάγκη νὰ καθορισθῇ προηγουμένως τὸ περιεχόμενον, ἡ ἀποστολὴ καὶ ἡ μέθοδος τῆς ἐρεῦνης τῶν ἐπιστημῶν τούτων.

Ἐφ' ὅσον ἡ πολιτειολογία ὡς ὑποκείμενον τῆς ἐρεῦνης τῆς ἔχει τὴν σπουδαιότητα ἐκ τῶν κοινωνικῶν ὁργανώσεων, τὸ κράτος, θεωρούμενον ὡς κοινωνικὸν φαινόμενον καὶ ὡς νομικὸν θεσμόν, ἢ, κατὰ τὸν Georg Jellineck, «τὴν γνῶσιν τῆς ἐμφανίσεως τοῦ κράτους κατὰ πάσας τὰς διευθύνσεις τῆς ὑπάρξεώς του»¹, δύο εἶναι τὰ μέρη, εἰς τὰ ὅποια ἀναλύεται, ἡ κοινωνικὴ πολιτειολογία καὶ ἡ νομικὴ πολιτειολογία. Τὰ δύο ταῦτα μέρη, εἰς τὰ ὅποια ἀναλύεται ἡ πολιτειολογία, ἀν καὶ συνδέονται ἐσωτερικῶς, ἀντιδιαστέλλονται ἀλλήλων ὡς πρὸς τὸ περιεχόμενον καὶ τὴν χρησιμοποιουμένην μέθοδον: Τὸ πρῶτον ἐρευνᾷ τὸ πραγματικὸν εἶναι, τὰ ἀντικειμενικῶς συμβαίνοντα ἐν τῇ ζωῇ τῶν κρατῶν, ὡς λ.χ. τοὺς ὅρους τῆς γενέσεως, τῆς ἀκμῆς καὶ τῆς παρακμῆς, τοὺς σκοποὺς, τὰ γνωρίσματα — ἔδαφος, λαός, δύναμις — τὰς μορφάς, ὑφ' ὧς ἐμφανίζεται, τὴν ἐπίδρασιν, τὴν ὁποίαν ἀσκεῖ ἐπὶ τὰς ἄλλας ἐκδηλώσεις τοῦ πολιτισμοῦ κλπ., χρησιμοποιεῖ δὲ τὴν μέθοδον τῶν κοινωνικῶν ἐπιστημῶν, αἵτινες ἀνάγονται εἰς νόμους — ὑπὸ τοὺς νόμους νοουμένης τῆς συμπεριλήψεως σειρᾶς γεγονότων, περὶ τῆς ἐπαναλήψεως τῶν ὁποίων πιστοποιεῖ ἡ πείρα. Τὸ δὲ δεύτερον μέρος ἐρευνᾷ τὴν νομικὴν φύσιν τοῦ κράτους καὶ ἔχει περιεχόμενον τοὺς ἐν τῷ πραγματικῷ εἶναι τοῦ κράτους ἐκφραζομένους νομικοὺς κανόνας τοῦ δέοντος γενέσθαι, οἵτινες, ἐπειδὴ εἶναι ἐν ἰσχύϊ καὶ παρ' αὐτοὺς ὑπάρχει ἡ ἐγγύτης περὶ τῆς ἐκτελέσεώς των, μετέχουν πλὴν τοῦ δέοντος γενέσθαι καὶ τοῦ εἶναι, χρησιμοποιεῖ δὲ τὴν μέθοδον τῶν νομικῶν ἐπιστημῶν, αἵτινες καθορίζουν τοὺς κανόνας τοῦ δέοντος γενέσθαι, οἵτινες πραγματοποιοῦνται διὰ τῶν ἀνθρωπίνων σκέψεων καὶ ἐνεργειῶν.

Ἡ δὲ πολιτικὴ εἶναι ἡ ἐπιστήμη, ἢ κατ' ἄλλους ἡ ἐπιστήμη καὶ ἡ τέχνη συγχρόνως, ἣτις ἀσχολεῖται μὲ τὴν ὁργάνωσιν καὶ τὴν διακυβέρνησιν τοῦ κράτους ὡς πρὸς τὰς ἐσωτερικὰς καὶ τὰς ἐξωτερικὰς ὑποθέσεις του, ἢ,

¹ Georg Jellineck, *Allgemeine Staatslehre*, Berlin 1921, σελ. 9.